



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/914,432	12/03/2001	Teodor s Akinfiev	1379-014	3735

23565 7590 12/03/2002

KLAUBER & JACKSON
411 HACKENSACK AVENUE
HACKENSACK, NJ 07601

EXAMINER

MCANULTY, TIMOTHY P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3682

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/914,432

Applicant(s)

AKINFIEV ET AL.

Examiner

Timothy P McAnulty

Art Unit

3682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the:

- a. the spring as claimed in line 4 of claim 5, and
- b. the movable link being self-blocking as claimed in line 3 of claim 9,

must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains two paragraphs.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 3682

5. Claims 2-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The recitation of “other extreme” in line 7 of claim 2 is unclear.
- b. The recitation of “the other extreme” in line 11 of claim 2 lacks antecedent basis.
- c. The recitation of “the connection” in line 2 of claim 5 lacks antecedent basis.
- d. The recitation of “these extremes” in line 3 of claim 8 lacks antecedent basis.
- e. In line 3 of claim 10, it is unclear as to what the recitation of “them” refers.
- f. The recitation of “the extremes” in lines 5 and 7 of claim 11 lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vainstock.

Vainstock discloses in figures 1-3, a two axis transfer device 10 comprising a first motor 18; a second motor 20; said first motor and said second motor mounted to a frame 12; a first link 50; a second link 52; said first link and said second link each having two extremes; and a tool 64 connected to said first link and said second link; wherein one extreme of said first link is connected by means of an articulation to said first motor, one extreme of said second link is

Art Unit: 3682

connected by means of an articulation to said second motor, and said other extreme of said first link and said other extreme of said second link are connected and support said tool.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vainstock in view of Nunes et al.

Vainstock discloses the basic apparatus as previously cited but does not disclose a spring located within the connection between said tool, said first link, and said second link. However, Nunes et al. teaches in figures 1 and 2, a robotic tooling apparatus having a spring located within the connection between a working tool 12 and a link 14 of said robotic arm. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Vainstock in view of the teachings of Nunes et al. to provide a spring in the connection between said tool, said first link, and said second link to provide a resilient mounting of said tool to reduce damage to said transfer device and thus improve reliability and service life.

10. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vainstock.

Vainstock discloses the basic apparatus as previously cited and further discloses in lines 20-27 of column 3, that a plurality of different working elements may be attached to said tool.

Art Unit: 3682

Vainstock does not disclose the first link and the second link corresponding to certain working elements having larger lengths than the first link and the second link corresponding to other working elements. However, it would have been an obvious matter of engineering design choice to provide said first link and said second corresponding to one working element with larger lengths than a first link and a second link corresponding to a different working element, since such a modification would have merely involved a change in size of a component. A change in size of a component is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art regarding transfer mechanism in general:

US Patent No. 6,328,510 B1 to Hanrath et al.

US Patent No. 5,886,494 to Prentice et al.

US Patent No. 5,421,695 to Kimura

US Patent No. 5,248,923 to Kimura et al.

US Patent No. 4,618,309 to Gregg et al.

US Patent No. 4,256,947 to De Candia

US Patent No. RE 37,731 E to Ogawa et al.


Art Unit: 3682

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy P McAnulty whose telephone number is 703.308.8684. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bucci can be reached on 703.308.3668. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703.305.7687 for regular communications and 703.305.7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.308.1113.

tpm
December 2, 2002


Thomas R. Hannon
Primary Examiner